"Inside the Union" explores the labor movement in America today as seen and experienced by a union local -- steelworkers -- in East Chicago, Indiana.

It is an attempt to see beyond the often stereotypical assumptions made about the blue-collar worker, to get in touch with a piece of America, a part of our history, a segment of our society that too often is overlooked, or ignored.

East Chicago is a mill town, a company town, a union town, and many of the steelworkers who live and work there have their roots in the labor struggle of the 1930's. Yet, the dangers and frustrations of their daily existence are still very much a part of their lives. So are certain of the ideals and aspirations from which the labor movement sprung.

It is important to say something about what this union story is not. It is not about corruption, or scandal, or the misuse of pension funds. It is no longer so much about money, a living wage, as it is about justice -- in the workplace, and within the union itself.

This story is about principles and issues that go to the heart of the labor movement and the spirit and convictions of the workers who have struggled in that cause. It is about the Mezos and Olzanskis, the Penas and Robinsons, the Gyurkos and Rosses who work everyday in the mill, and for the union. Often, they find themselves at odds with both.

What was found in East Chicago was not the easy stereotypes often associated with the blue-collar worker but an articulate expression of felt needs and wants, and goals. When it was suggested to one steelworker that his son, also a steelworker and a union griever in the mill, might someday be a labor leader, he replied matter-of-factly: "He is a labor leader."

Maybe that's the point of the story. This was their version of the labor movement, the union story, as seen and felt in the workplace and union hall -- a story which sometimes seems lost in the declarations of "big labor" and "big business," or, as the script suggests, "in the din of the mill."

TALKING POINTS ON SCRIPT

-- At the outset, Commentator Herman states that "some" say that labor is "as establishment as big business," "the labor movement has lost its way," and then adds: "but what are workers saying, the 20 million Americans paying union dues?"

-- "To find out," he adds, "we didn't go to the AFL-CIO or conduct surveys or examine statistics. Instead, we came here to the biggest local in one of the biggest, most powerful unions in America."

-- In brief, to find out what 20 million American union members are saying, CBS-TV goes to one local union that is part of the power base of the opponent of President McBride and a local union that voted 2-to-1 against him in the last union election.

-- To find out what 20 million workers are saying, you cannot go to one local union of the background of Local 1010 and represent that as representative of the rest of the labor movement.

-- Any reporter who is knowledgeable about the United Steelworkers recognizes the political realities of the present situation in our union, what has transpired in past elections and conventions and is familiar with the political tactics of Local 1010 and District 31. They also know that Local 1010 represents a minority viewpoint on such issues as rank-and-file ratification.

-- Unidentified Steelworker states: "U.S. Steel in Gary, they still have what they call a riot gate--big gates that they close when the peasants rise up against them, I guess."

-- That is colorful and descriptive language but there has not been an industry-wide strike in basic steel since 1959 and when there was an industry-wide strike prior to that time, we hardly needed a lone picket at each company simply because of solid support for the strikes and the inability of anyone else to operate the mills.

-- Unidentified delegate complains about scheduling. This statement is very generalized; consequently it is very difficult to give a short and concise answer to the question posed. There is some truth in the statement but the subject area needs to be discussed in considerable detail, with qualifying and excepting comments made.

1977 Negotiations

-- It should be noted at the outset that this general subject matter received considerable attention in the 1977 Basic Steel Negotiations, and,that a substantial breakthrough was made, as described in the following statement from Page 47 of "Booklet No. PR-229" (United Steelworkers of America 1977 Steel Settlement):

"Scheduling

For years the companies have engaged in the disruptive practice at many locations of changing schedules almost at will and in violation of the posting provisions of our agreement. It has been the feeling at all levels of the Union that the companies could ignore posted schedules because there was no meaningful remedy or penalty to act as a deterrent to the companies and to at least partially compensate our members for the inconvenience. Now, employees whose posted schedules are violated will receive a penalty payment equal to four times the standard hourly wage rate for the day that they are removed from the schedule. If they are rescheduled to work another day, the day removed from the schedule will be considered as a day worked for computing the 6th or 7th day of the work week for overtime purposes."

-- The actual contract language which provides for the above appears on Page 83 of the Inland Agreement and reads as follows:

"Should changes be made in schedules contrary to this Paragraph (3) so that an employee is laid off and does not work on a day that he was scheduled to work, he shall be deemed to have reported for work on such day and shall be eligible for reporting allowance in accordance with provisions of Section 4 of Article 10, excluding that portion of marginal paragraph 10.14 referring to Company notice to him not to report not less than 2 hours before his scheduled starting time and marginal paragraph 10.15."

Overtime Assignments and Discipline

-- One approach to this subject area is the manner in which overtime assignments are treated by arbitrators in cases involving discipline for refusal to accept such an assignment.

-- As a general rule, an employee has an obligation to accept a compulsory overtime assignment. If the employee believes that the assignment is improper, he should perform it under protest and file a grievance. He may refuse to accept the assignment, however, for compelling personal reasons* provided he explains those reasons to management at the time.

* i.e., seriously adverse personal consequences flowing from performance of the assignment.

-- The general rule regarding overtime assignments is subject to some exceptions, especially where such assignment is made on short notice, and compliance with which might seriously inconvenience the employee. The amount of advance notice given to the employee and the urgency of the company's need for his services are among the factors taken into account.

-- Examples from actual Basic Steel arbitration cases illustrate the general rule and exceptions. Refusal to work one hour overtime was held to have been justified as to three employees who had been given no advance notice:

a) one man had to get to the bank to deposit his paycheck;

b) another had been declining overtime work because of a back injury;

c) the third had no way to get home except to ride with the second man.

-- In another case, a one-day disciplinary suspension for refusal to work overtime on an emergency "hot repair" job was set aside as in violation of the safety and health provision of the agreement; the grievants had worked as a reduced crew for eight hours and had reported to the foreman that they were sick from the intense heat, and the foreman made no effort to determine whether any of the men were sick or had reason to believe that additional exposure to intense heat might unduly jeopardize their health.

In another case, a two-day suspension of a labor bracer for refusal to work an extra 8-hour turn after he had worked a full turn was set aside as unjustified, since there was no showing that any emergency or necessity existed which might have required the grievant to work overtime, the job was an unskilled one on which a replacement should have been easy to find, and the company had made no effort to find a replacement before ordering the grievant to double over.

Scheduling Daily or Weekly Overtime

-- The contract requirement that the company schedule employees on the basis of the normal 8-hour workday and normal 40-hour workweek prohibits the establishment of a normal workday of more than 8 hours but it does not deprive the company of the right to require employees, on occasion, to work overtime. Scheduling an employee to work 12 hours is not a violation of the agreement where the situation is a unique and non-recurring one and management believes such scheduling is essential for operating reasons. The company could schedule employees on 12-hour turns over a period of several weeks where an abnormal situation is involved, e.g. an extensive rehabilitation of a furnace.

-- Attached is a self-explanatory 1975 arbitration award dealing with subject of schedule change and involving Local 1010 at Inland Steel.

-- Unidentified Steelworker complains about "this business of production first and safety last."

-- Our union played a leading role in passage of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970.

-- We did the same regarding passage of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977. (91 miners killed in the Sunshine Mine disaster in Kellogg, Idaho, in May, 1972.)

-- We successfully waged a five-year fight to establish standards on coke oven emissions--1971 to 1976--and joined in court battle with Labor Department to preserve standards against a challenge by industry.

-- We are conducting similar campaigns for standards on lead, benzene, beryllium and carcinogens in general.

-- Our Safety and Health department is staffed by outstanding technicians and specialists.

-- At each negotiations we emphasize safety and health language and provisions in the settlement.

-- Also, local unions have the right to strike over safety and health. Local 1010 has not chosen to do so.

-- Unidentified Steelworker complains about fact that his pension is only about $450 a month after 30 years' service.

-- That is exclusive of Social Security.

-- Surviving spouses of members receive pensions.

-- Prior retirees traditionally have their pensions increased at each negotiations.

** -- Could write a book on the sweeping generalizations, editorializing and misleading statements on this page.

-- Unidentified International Representative says: "I have a responsibility to tell the local union that until such time as we receive any directions from McBride, we will not honor that picket line."

-- Implications are that a picket line will not be honored in traditional manner. But left hanging is what picket line, by whom, over what issue? Is it a wildcat strike? There are serious financial fines that can be levied upon a union in a wildcat strike situation. Also, once a settlement on a contract is reached, the union must honor that contract.

** -- George Herman identifies McBride as the international president and then talks about conflict between Local 1010 and the International, adding: "The way 1010's leadership sees it, they had fought the company for rights as workers, rights they see being lost to a union establishment whose direction they must follow, whether they like it or not."

-- Could take issue with words "rights they see being lost." Should have said "rights they claim or charge are being lost."

-- Use of "union establishment" is terribly misleading. The officers are elected by the membership. They reflect the desires of the membership. Use of "establishment" implies that the union is run by the officers on their own, in a "conservative" manner and by private decisions, and not subject to the wishes of the members. It is a term used by candidates in a political campaign when they attempt to label their opponents with such tactics. It was a label used by McBride's opponent in the last campaign.

-- Herman's phrase that Local 1010's leadership sees it losing rights to a union establishment "whose direction they must follow, whether they like it or not." That's democracy, the same "democracy in the union" that Herman, a few seconds later, refers to as one of the issues involved in the struggle "within the union itself."

-- Every policy or bargaining decision that is made in our union is the result of a vote by the members, delegates to a convention or members of our International Executive Board which is made up of the democratically-elected 25 district directors, the national director of Canada and the five international officers.

-- No one agrees with all the decisions. But that's democracy. Herman's choice of words amounted to editorializing at its worst and couldn't have been more misleading and were expressed from a complete lack of knowledge or appreciation of our democratic procedures.

** -- Herman states: "The struggle is no longer just with the company, but within the union itself, over issues that go to the very spirit of the labor movement: the right to strike, the right-to-ratify contracts--democracy in the union."

-- When he says the struggle is "within the union itself" over these issues he is wrong. It would have been accurate if he had said the struggle between the leadership of Local 1010 and the majority viewpoint within the union. There is no struggle "within" the union over these issues. These are old issues that have been resolved but which 1010 uses for political purposes.

-- He also neglected to state that the majority of our members ratify their contracts, have the right to strike and that basic steel members have the right to strike over local issues.

-- There is no explanation, however brief, of the background or reasoning for the bargaining procedure in basic steel, or how it was decided to use the procedure, or how well it has served the basic steel members who enjoy the highest wages and most generous benefits of any segment of our union. The <u>average</u> basic steel member makes slightly more than $20,000 a year.

-- Herman also uses the phrase, in talking about the issues that go to the spirit of the labor movement, "democracy in the union." If he or CBS had done their homework, in an objective manner, such a statement would not have been made. CBS could not have avoided saying that our union is a democratic union.

1. Our international officers and district directors are elected every four years by a rank-and-file referendum secret ballot vote.
2. Our local union officers are elected every three years by the membership of each local union.
3. Delegates to our conventions are elected by the local union membership.
4. Members of the International Wage Policy Committee and members of the industry conferences that determine the general collective bargaining policy of our union and the four major industries are elected by our local unions.
5. Contracts in our four major industry conferences are ratified by the presidents of the local unions in each industry conference.
6. The bargaining policy was determined by our Constitutional Conventions, by the delegates, upon the recommendation of the International Executive Board.
7. Since 1945, there have been 95 contests for district director involving 232 candidates. In the same span, there have been 16 races for the top offices.
8. The 1973 local union elections, for example, involved candidates seeking some 60,000 posts in 5,292 local unions with another 18,000 members involved in handling the election machinery, tabulating and reporting the results.

9. Our International Tellers, elected by various regions at conventions, supervise the counting of ballots by an outside, impartial organization. The constitution states: "The International Tellers shall retain the services of a public spirited and impartial organization experienced in the conduct of elections. The organization so retained by the International Tellers, shall under the supervision of the International Tellers, tabulate the votes cast for the various nominees and file this tabulation with the International Tellers."

The last international election saw the Labor Department supervise the election to an extent never before in any union election and the supervision was done at the request of the union.

Investigations by both Labor Departments of the U. S. and Canada verified the honesty of the election and the results. The losing candidates requested the U. S. investigation under Landrum-Griffin which does not apply in Canada. However, we asked the Canadian government to investigate the voting there.

10. Election results show that "democracy is alive and well within the Steelworkers."

11. In the 1973 local union elections, for example, there were 9,133 new officers elected as opposed to 17,327 holdovers.

12. In the 1976 local union elections there was a larger turnover. Some 45 percent of local union presidents were voted out of office.

13. The slate of international officers prior to the present incumbents were elected in 1965 and unseated the then incumbent officers.

14. The International Executive Board prior to the present one, was made up of 17 members (of 28) who got into office by opposing the winning candidacies of Abel-Burke-Molony in 1965.

15. In the last international union election, there were contests for each of the five top offices and in 15 of the union's 25 districts. <u>The result was the biggest turnover in district directors in the union's history.</u>

16. A professional, objective look at how our union functions would have uncovered these facts. We would have been most happy to have given such facts to CBS.

** -- Following Herman's broad, generalizations about rights and democracy, an unidentified Steelworker makes the flat assertion "there's very little democracy in the Steelworkers' union."

-- That incorrect generalization, of course, is refuted by the points made under the previous response to Herman's statement.

** -- The same unidentified Steelworker makes the following additional comment: "We have a no strike agreement that was signed by the leadership without consulting in any way with the membership that says that, regardless of what we're offered in contract negotiations, we can't strike on an industry-wide basis any more."

-- The Experimental Negotiating Agreement was approved by the Basic Steel Industry Conference, the presidents of the local unions in basic steel, during a two-day conference. The procedure was explained, debated and questions answered. It was approved by the presidents by a virtual unanimous vote.

-- ENA was publicized in our union newspaper and in speeches by our officers.

-- It was used for the first time in 1974 when the local union presidents approved its use again in the 1977 negotiations. Again, in 1977, it was approved by the local union presidents for use again in 1980. Its use in succeeding negotiations is up to the local union presidents.

-- Also, when the member says there can be no strike "regardless of what we're offered," the implication is definitely there that the negotiations are a one-way street in which the industry dictates the terms. This is 100% wrong. There is a real adversary relationship; real, tough bargaining. The last two settlements were the best in our history.

** -- Steelworker Jim Robinson complains because he learned from TV that the contract has been settled.

-- News media covers our negotiations closely. Couldn't keep final terms a secret until notified the members, even if we tried. Our own members give out the details to the media, even while they are being briefed on the terms. Some will go outside the room and hand the settlement summary to reporters. A news conference is always held by the union and the industry after ratification by the Basic Steel Industry Conference. If we didn't, the media would raise hell.

-- Herman says: "Most Steelworkers don't question the need for a union. Many do question what's happened in the union since it was organized, and where it should be going."

-- Broad generalization and assumptions. The opposite could also be stated: "Most Steelworkers don't question the need for a union. Also many do not question what's happened in the union since it was organized and are happy with where it's going."

-- All right, what has happened in the union that is being questioned? What direction should it be going? Nothing is said to back up these generalizations. The basic responsibility of a union is the negotiation of contracts, protecting the economic security of its members and working for passage of legislation that will benefit them and their families.

-- Herman's general statement is a conclusive statement that begs for substantiation or explanation.

-- Two familiar, old complaints, so commonplace when you talk to some who are unhappy with the way things are going and who, for political reasons at the local or international level, are that the leadership is in bed with the company and that Pittsburgh stuffs contracts down the members' throats. These two old complaints are voiced by unidentified Steelworkers on Page 14.

-- One of the workers defines "good, solid trade unionism" as "fighting companies," whatever that means. We prefer to define solid trade unionism as being a responsible trade union that negotiates solid and meaningful contracts for its members and not a trade union that has its members out on strike all the time.

** -- Herman makes this statement: "Most large unions which negotiate nationwide contracts go back to their membership for approval. That's not true for workers in basic steel. That's what the right-to-ratify is all about."

-- Let's look at some 10 of the largest unions in the country. Teamsters, with 2 million members, negotiate a national master freight agreement that covers about 300,000 workers, representing 24% of its membership and the single, largest segment of the union. They do ratify by rank-and-file vote but it takes a two-thirds vote to reject the contract negotiated by the top-level negotiators. Retail Clerks, with 750,000 members, negotiate no nationwide contracts.

Amalgamated Meat Cutters, with 500,000, do negotiate a master contract with major packers, and do ratify by rank-and-file.

Auto Workers, with 1.5 million members, negotiate with major auto companies separately. Will negotiate with one of them and then attempt to use that as a pattern with other two of the Big Three. Do ratify by rank-and-file vote.

Machinists, with 930,000 members, negotiate with the major airlines but separately. Also negotiate in aerospace separately with the companies. So can't say they are nationwide negotiations.

Communications Workers, 600,000 members, negotiate with the Bell system (AT&T) but it is negotiations with a single authority. Ratify by rank-and-file vote.

Service Employes, 700,000 members, no nationwide contracts.

State County, Municipal Workers, 1.4 million, no nationwide contracts.

Carpenters, 700,000, no nationwide contracts. Some by rank-and-file vote, some by negotiating teams.

IBEW, over 1 million, does negotiate nationwide contracts and ratify by rank-and-file votes.

Of those top 10, three can be said to negotiate nationwide contracts and to ratify by rank-and-file vote. The other seven do not negotiate nationwide contracts.

-- Herman says that Local 1010 members feel "they've achieved democracy in their own local union, but they're not confident the same rules will apply at the convention in Atlantic City."

-- The rules at the Convention are clearly spelled out. The Convention Call is mailed in advance of the Convention to each local union, spelling out the procedure for electing delegates, resolving contested credentials, how many delegates the locals are entitled to elect (based on membership), how resolutions are to be submitted for consideration by the convention, etc.

At the opening of each convention, the Rules and Order of Business are read to the convention and voted on by the delegates.

Herman's statement by itself is editorializing and omits important and pertinent information on convention procedure and rules.

-- Unidentified Steelworker: "That convention is run in a very undemocratic manner. It's very hard to get on the floor and make changes in policy--to reflect what the membership wants."

The convention record shows that 227 delegates spoke during the convention, that 51 of the delegates who spoke were from District 31--the largest number of any speakers from any district, that 14 of the speakers were from Local 1010--the largest number from any local union. Also, District 31 has a mike all to itself. Other districts must share mikes.

-- Unidentified Steelworker: "Every staffman in the Steelworkers union is at the convention. Every staffman is appointed by the president. So that gives you an idea of how effective you can be at opposing the leadership's policies--they owe their jobs to the man whose policies we're voting on."

Every staffman was not at the convention.

Every staff representative is appointed by the president, generally upon the recommendation of the district directors. Once on the staff he has what amounts to tenure, complete job security. He has his own union that negotiates for him and represents him.

Many staff reps run for International Office. That's the usual process in our union. Ed Sadlowski, as a staffman, ran for district director and won. As director ran for the international presidency and lost but went back on the staff. There are no political reprisals in our union for political activity.

Staff reps made up about 700 of delegates at last convention; credentials committee seated 4,227 delegates. So staff reps clearly are a minority and furthermore, if they are there as delegates, they have to be elected as delegates by a local union.

-- Unidentified Steelworker: Complains that staff reps don't work in the mills and "don't necessarily speak for the membership."

-- Staff reps come out of the plant or the mills. Can't work in the mills and be a staff rep at the same time because being a staff rep is a full-time job.

-- If they don't speak for the membership, who do they speak for?

-- Unidentified Steelworker says the first thing done at the convention is that "they" fix the rules and then start intimidating delegates. Convention rules were explained earlier. Regarding intimidation, our conventions are always covered by 40 to 70 reporters and we ask you to put that intimidation charge to them for response. It is simply not true.

-- Camera immediately, after the speaker on intimidation, shows a speaker at a mike claiming to be bullied off the mike like he was before.

-- First, delegate Cec Taylor of Local 1005, was not bullied off the mike "like before." He was ruled out-of-order because he asked for a point of information after a delegate had moved the previous question. That's all. The proceedings show no comment at that time by him about being "bullied."

-- The film showing the bullying situation came on a perennial convention question about the use of Cushing's Rules and the film did not show that McBride answered his question. Film gave impression that the delegate was shut off from asking his question, but he did get to ask it and he got his answer--neither of which was shown.

-- Herman says Local 1010 delegates were surprised by a speakers' list, "had protested, and it was withdrawn."

-- The facts: A question about speakers' lists was raised first by a delegate (Hallin) from Local 2251, District 6, on Monday afternoon, the first day of the convention. President McBride responded: "As in other years, rather than have people standing for long periods of time at a mike, we have permitted people to express a desire to speak on a subject and be placed in an order. Now, you would have that same privilege. So, it's not essential that it be done that way, but it is a fact rather than have people standing for long long periods of time, the Sergeants-at-Arms have entertained the idea that a person expressing a desire to speak and putting his name down would be allowed the mike in that order. Now, if that creates a problem, we don't have to do it that way, but it has been done and is being done now."

-- A delegate from 1010 (Olszanski), following McBride's answer, then also raised a question about the lists and McBride responded: "If there is a list, you will certainly be on it. I don't know that we are going to have that problem, but if we do, we'll deal with it."

-- Then, on the <u>morning</u> of the second day, a delegate (Mezo) from 1010 complained about a speakers' list in District 31 and McBride responded: "All right. If there is objection and confusion as to the using of a list on Mike 3 (the one used for District 31), we won't use a list." None of this was shown on the program.

-- The script then immediately goes to Producer Irv Drasnin who asks a Local 1010 delegate: "You feel the only way you could get a chance to talk on the right-to-ratify this afternoon was to stay here and wait in line for the microphone?"

-- This comment by the producer came after McBride had announced that no list was going to be used in District 31 in which 1010 is located and it also ignored the fact that District 31 has its own mike and that only District 31 delegates use the mike.

-- The delegate's answer to the producer's question was: "Well, we're just not taking any chances." In other words, they did not directly respond to the leading question that they feel it's the only way they could get a chance to talk.

-- The record shows that 17 delegates spoke on the right-to-ratify issue. Five of the speakers were from District 31, including the president of 1010 (Andrews) and two other delegates from 1010, and Director Balanoff of District 31, former president of 1010, who spoke from the rostrum.

-- Herman says: "The leadership has tried to defuse the right-to-ratify issue by postponing it. Local 1010 and its supporters want it decided here."

-- Statement ignores a number of vital facts.

-- President McBride announced the morning of the first day of the convention that the issue would be acted upon on the following day in the afternoon and said he was announcing it then, "In order that everyone might have an opportunity to participate in that debate and voting...we don't want you to be surprised then if you come back and what may prove to be a key issue has been settled in your absence. So, we would urge all of you to be present tomorrow afternoon for the debate on that resolution."

-- Herman's statement about attempting to "defuse" the issue by "postponing" it, is terribly slanted and misleading. As the debate and the voting showed, there was nothing to "defuse." The overwhelming majority opposed 1010's position. Herman chose to interpret referring the issue to the appropriate forum for a decision as "postponing." As was noted in the debate, an important reason for the decision on contract ratification to be referred to the Basic Steel Industry Conference is that the decision concerns only Basic Steel and such a decision should be made by the Basic Steel Industry Conference. If it were made at the convention, you would have delegates from copper, aluminum, the office and clerical people, etc., deciding an issue that doesn't concern them.

-- Additionally, District 31, at the previous convention in 1976, tried to have the entire ENA submitted to the entire membership for a vote and was soundly defeated. Once again, one has to realize the politics of the situation and the political motives of the delegates and locals and districts. Our members and the delegates at the convention are aware of these facts, and that is one reason for some of the booing.

** -- Immediately after Herman makes his comment about defusing and postponing, the film shows an unidentified delegate saying--and saying only these words: "This undemocratic action..."

-- If that isn't selective editing, we don't know what is.

-- One significant speech was made on the issue by District 34 Director Buddy Davis, who succeeded McBride as director of that district. He did not speak from the rostrum but spoke from where the District 34 delegates were seated and he began his remarks as follows: "Mr. Chairman, I might also say that, unlike my friend and fellow board member, Jim Balanoff, who had the privilege of speaking from the podium, I stood here for over an hour at this mike waiting my turn, and I want you to know, Mr. Chairman, there is no rancor in my heart to that preferential treatment that you have given Director Balanoff. I have enjoyed very much my stay in this line."

-- After the committee's recommendation on the collective bargaining resolution (that included the ratification issue) was overwhelmingly upheld by a standing vote, a delegate from 1010 requested a roll call vote.

-- Herman states there is "no doubt" on 1010's demand for a roll call vote, "There's never been one at a Steelworker convention." That's because one has never been voted. The delegates make that decision. But Herman attaches some sinister connotation to that fact. That's democracy, whether CBS likes it or not.

-- The head count for the roll call vote showed only 316 delegates voting for such a roll call. Thirty percent, or 1,149 delegates, would have to vote for a roll call for one to be taken.

-- There obviously was no sentiment for a roll call, or any support for 1010's position on the ratification issue.

** -- The program then immediately goes to the fourth day on the issue of banning outside contributors to candidates for offices in the union.

-- Herman states: "The leadership sees it as a way to keep the union free of outside influence. Local 1010 sees it as an attempt to stop challenges to the leadership. That's the issue. The point is what happened when Jim Balanoff rose to speak against the proposal."

-- Why is that the point? Herman doesn't say. Balanoff was booed. So are other speakers. So what? Again, the delegates realize the politics involved and know that the overwhelming majority favors banning outside contributors, that Balanoff is making a speech for political purposes. The film gives the wrong impression that Balanoff was prevented from having his say because of the booing. That was not the fact. He had his say. Again, he spoke from the rostrum, as did District 33 Director Wampler who opposed the resolution.

-- Also, Herman said the "leadership sees it" i.e., banning outside contributors, as a way to keep the union free of outside influence. And as the voting showed, so did the overwhelming majority of the delegates.

-- Although President McBride was interviewed for a good hour by Herman at the convention, only about two minutes of the interview was shown during the program, at the very end after all the editorializing and selective editing had been shown. Then after McBride said he thought it had been a good convention and that the will of the majority "was clearly expressed," Herman makes this comment: "There are two views of this convention; in some ways, two views of this union: one from the podium, and one from the floor--at least from where Local 1010 sits. This is how it looked to them."

-- Again, this is unfair editorializing or slanting, especially when he says there are in some ways "two views of this union." Any unbiased observer of the convention, and this includes the knowledgeable reporters who have covered our conventions for some time, know that the will of the majority was clearly expressed at the convention, that there was full debate and democratic decisions made. Implicit in Herman's comment is the conclusion that the officers and majority of the delegates prevented Local 1010 and their sympathizers from being heard at the convention and that somehow this is bad.

-- Then the film engages in some more slick editing by showing rapid voting on issues, with long-range shots of the general convention hall during the "aye" voting and close-ups of a few 1010 or other local delegates voting no, with the sound levels in each case sounding equal. The attempt here was to give the impression of steamroller voting tactics and that was not the case at all. This was a vicious piece of slanted "reporting."

Jack Schieckbeck
Institute for Media Studies
Box 7279
Austin, Texas 78712

Dr.,

As promised here is some bedtime reading.

Material was prepared by Public Relations Dept of UWA.

Will call next week.

Thanks,

Josh Selim Beck